



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,169	03/15/2002	Eric Marechal	213993US0PCT	8971
22850	7590	08/24/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			NAVARRO, ALBERT MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/926,169

Applicant(s)

MARECHAL ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Navarro

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 and 12-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants amendment filed March 29, 2004 has been received and entered.

Claims 4-9 and 12-17 remain pending in the instant application.

All grounds of rejection in the prior Office Action mailed November 28, 2003 are withdrawn.

The following new grounds of rejection are applied to the claims:

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4-6, 8, 12, and 15-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims recite the abbreviation "MGDG." However, this abbreviation could easily be construed as a short peptide. Amendment of the claims to recite the full term of the identified molecule is suggested. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are directed to pharmaceutical compositions comprising an MGDG synthase inhibitor and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, as well as methods of treatment.

Facts that should be considered in determining whether a specification is enabling, or if it would require an undue amount of experimentation to practice the invention include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary to practice the invention, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1403 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Federal Circuit has noted, however, that only those factors that are relevant based on the facts need to be addressed. See Enzo Biochem. Inc. v. Calgene, Inc. 188 F.3d 1362, 1371, 52 USPQ2d 1129, 1135 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Reed et al (US Patent Number 5,702,897) set forth that some agents intended to inhibit the function of cellular proteins have difficulties crossing the cell wall. (See columns 7-8).

A pharmaceutical composition/vaccine “must by definition trigger an immunoprotective response in the host vaccinated; mere antigenic response is not enough.” In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Given the lack of guidance, lack of working examples, and unpredictable nature of the invention as shown by Reed et al, one of skill in the art would be forced into excessive experimentation to practice the broadly claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1645

3. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims 12-17 are directed to compositions comprising an MGDG synthase inhibitor, and MGDG synthase inhibitors selected by the method of claim 4.

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, MGDG synthase inhibitor alone is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The protein itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 4-9, 12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marechal et al or Marechal et al.

The claims are directed to a method for screening and for selecting antiparasitic agents, herbicides or combinations thereof, comprising incubating a substance to be tested with an MGDG synthase or with a plastidial membrane isolated from a plant, and measuring the specific enzymatic activity, after said incubation.

Marechal et al (Plant Lipid Metabolism, pp 144-151, 1995 or Journal of Biological Chemistry Vol. 269, No. 8, pp 5788-5798, Feb. 25, 1994) disclose of studying the pattern of inhibition of MGDG syntase activity by UDP relative to different substrates. (See abstract of Plant Lipid Metabolism).

In view that Marechal et al disclose of incubating a substance with MGDG synthase and measuring the specific enzymatic activity after the incubation, the disclosure of Marechal et al is deemed to anticipate the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1645

4. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Furneaux et al.

The claims are directed to a pharmaceutical composition comprising an MGDG synthase inhibitor and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

Furneaux et al (US Patent Number 5,985,848) disclose of compositions for the treatment of parasites comprising compounds which inhibit nucleoside phosphorylase. (See claims).

Given that any compound which inhibits DNA formation or function will ripple downstream as a protein inhibitor via altered or decreased expression, the composition disclosed by Furneaux et al is deemed to anticipate the claimed invention.

Since the Patent office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing Applicants' product with the product of the prior art reference, the burden is on Applicants to show an unobvious distinction between the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product and the product of the prior art. See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

5. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leber.

The claims are directed to a herbicide comprising an MGDG synthase inhibitor and a carrier, wherein the inhibitor is selected by the method claimed in claim 4.

Leber (US Patent Number 4,025,331) disclose of compositions for the treatment of plants comprising a herbicide and a carrier. (See claims).

It is noted that Leber do not select the herbicide via the method of claim 4, however since the claims are directed to a product, i.e., the herbicide, the recitation of how the product is isolated is not given any patentable weight.

Since the Patent office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing Applicants' product with the product of the prior art reference, the burden is on Applicants to show an unobvious distinction between the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product and the product of the prior art. See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro whose telephone number is (571) 272-0861.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark Navarro
Primary Examiner
August 18, 2004